THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
MARCH 21, 1986, IN LISNER HALL
Room 603

1 The meeting was called to order by Vice President French at 2:18 p.m.

Present: Vice President French, Registrar Grimm, Birnbaum, Della Torre, Eldridge, Fox, Greene, Griffith, Hill, Kelly, Kenney, Levy, Liebowitz, Loeser, Morgan, Pierpont, D. Robinson, L. Robinson, Singpurwalla, Smith, Solomon, Tolchin, Wallace, and Ziolkowski

Absent: President Elliott, Parliamentarian Schechter, Altshuler, Barron, Castleberry, Cheh, Claeyssens, East, Frey, Lovett, Parrish, Rashid, Schiff, and Schiller

2 The minutes of the Special Meeting of January 31, 1986, were approved, and the minutes of the regular meeting of February 14, 1986, were approved as corrected on Page 4, Minute 5(a), 2nd line, by changing the word "(Grievance)" to the correct word "(Governance)."

3 (a) On behalf of the Special Committee on Senate Self-Study (Governance), Professor Hill, Chair, moved the adoption of Resolution 85/11, "A Resolution to Implement Faculty Code Procedures, Section C-5." The motion was seconded by Professor Griffith, Chair of the Executive Committee, co-sponsor of this resolution. Professor Hill asked that the first line of Section I(A) of the resolution be corrected to read: "Within four (4) weeks after the September 1986 meeting. . ." instead of the "January 1987 meeting," and the correction was made. He then explained that this resolution reflected the precedent established in 1964-65, when Section C-5 was last implemented, giving the Faculty Senate the opportunity to offer guidance to the Faculty Assembly as to how it may fulfill its role under Section C-5 of the Faculty Code in the selection of a President. Because Section C-5 offers no guidance whatsoever to the Assembly on how to elect a consultative committee, Faculty Senate leadership in this respect is almost unavoidable as a practical matter. Therefore, the Executive Committee asked the Special Committee on Self-Study (Governance) to prepare a resolution to serve this purpose. Professor Hill said that the Special Committee, in preparing this resolution, drew upon two sources--first, from the lessons learned from past experience during the 1964-65 presidential succession, and, second, from a book entitled Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents, by John Nason, published in 1984. In modern presidential search procedures, Mr. Nason draws the following three conclusions: (1) there should be only one Search Committee; (2) the Search Committee should be comprised of trustees, faculty, alumni, and students; and (3) the Search Committee should be small in number. Professor Hill pointed out that the resolution envisions two possibilities with reference to the Search Committee in that some or all of the faculty consultants elected by the Faculty Assembly will be formally accepted by the Trustees as full participants on the Search Committee, along with other constituents, or the Trustees may decline to do so, in which case the faculty would experience the same confusion and impotency of its role as did its predecessors in the 1964-65 presidential search process.

Professor Tolchin noted that "full participation" could be subject to a variety of interpretations and did not necessarily mean "real representation"

3 on the Search Committee. Professor Hill responded that "full participation" in the Special Committee's view meant that the faculty would be engaging in all of the deliberations of the Search Committee in the fullest sense. He also said that the language was expressed this way because the Special Committee did not want the Faculty Consultative Committee to lose its identity altogether. Professor Fox said that he would prefer to see the Faculty Consultative Committee play a lesser role once some of its members have been selected by the Trustees for active membership on the Search Committee, particularly since there is the problem of privileged information referred to in Section II(D) of the resolution. Professor Griffith said that the Executive Committee worked closely with the Special Committee in preparing this resolution in order to provide a structure which would be flexible enough to give the faculty the fullest possible participation. He noted that this issue was a delicate situation, especially since the Board of Trustees itself was in a transition period because of the death of its last elected Chairman; therefore it was not possible to predict exactly what the Board of Trustees will do when it comes to the point of forming a Search Committee.

Professor Levy moved that Section II(B) be amended in lines 3 and 4 to replace the words "into full participation with" by the words "as full members of" so that the same would read: "(B) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall request the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof to accept some or all of its members as full members of the Trustee Search Committee. . . ." The motion was seconded. Professor Hill pointed out that the correlate language in Section II(C) would also have to be changed if the amendment is passed. Professor Tolchin commented that she thought this resolution was somewhat premature in the level of detail, and that the Senate might have a better chance of being listened to if this were simplified. She said that she thought the important message is that the faculty want a real role in this process and request that several faculty members be included on whatever Search Committee will be doing the real work of selecting a new President. Professor Morgan said that he did not consider this resolution premature at all, given the anticipated schedule of probable events that will have to occur before the end of June, 1988, plus the fact that the Faculty Assembly regularly meets only twice during the academic year. The question was called on the Levy amendment, and the amendment was passed.

Professor Fox then moved to delete the words "and avoid the isolation its predecessors suffered during the 1964-65 presidential succession" in the first sentence of Section II., because he thought that language was unnecessary. The motion was seconded. Professor Hill said that he had no objection to striking that language. Professor David Robinson said that he opposed the amendment because it seemed to him that the Faculty Senate has to be willing to stand up and be counted, unless it wants just to be a polite debating society. If the Senate is to be a significant force in the governance of this University, he said that it has to make clear that it wants a role in this process, that it did not get a role in the past, and that it is unhappy about that. Professor Levy voiced his support for the amendment because he did not think that provocative language was going to help matters whatsoever. Professor Griffith said that he opposed the amendment because there very likely will be many members of the Board of Trustees who may not know anything about the earlier history and this may cause them to look back and to find out what happened during that period which caused much ill-feeling. He said that he saw nothing wrong with reminding the Board what went on before and indicating that the Faculty Senate remembers even if the Board does not, and he opposed striking that language from the resolution. question was called on the Fox amendment, and the amendment was lost.

3 Professor Ziolkowski asked what would happen if none of the faculty are accepted by the Board of Trustees, and Professor Hill responded that in that event the Faculty Consultative Committee would try to work with the Board under the Code because the Board is bound by the Code to consult with that Committee. Professor Levy suggested that informal direct communication now with the Board of Trustees would be useful, and he suggested that the Chairman of the Executive Committee be designated to inform the Board of the Senate's plan in such a way that it doesn't seem like an adversarial proceeding. Professor Hill responded that past experience has shown that it isn't enough simply to get informal agreement by the Board as to what the role of the Faculty Consultative Committee will be. Professor Griffith said that the position of the Chairman of the Executive Committee is always much stronger if the Senate has agreed on what its position is, and he would prefer that the Senate first adopt Resolution 85/11, then he would be glad to speak to the Board of Trustees if there is a resolution from the Senate to this effect. Professor Tolchin said she agreed that it would be more effective if there was an informal track moving concurrently with this formal resolution and that she would be happy to offer a sense of the Senate resolution at the appropriate time. The question was then called on the original motion, as amended, and Resolution 85/11, as amended, was adopted. (Resolution 85/11 attached)

(b) On behalf of the Educational and Admissions Policy Committee, Professor Lilien Robinson, moved the adoption of Resolution 85/12, "A Resolution on Summer Sessions Calendar," with the following two amendments: (1) the second 3-Week Session should be: June 25---July 14; and (2) the third 3-Week Session should be: July 15---July 31. The motion was seconded. Professor Robinson explained that this resolution reflects an attempt to fulfill the needs of all the schools and colleges which had expressed some difficulty with the Academic Calendar approved by the Senate last year. She said that the basis for the two changes in the dates of the Second and Third 3-week Sessions was to provide more flexibility for the School of Education. The Registrar noted that the first 3-week session has 15 days, but the second and third 3-week sessions would have 14 and 13 days, respectively, if the two changes were approved. Professor Griffith said he thought it had been agreed that each 3-week session needs at least 15 class days. A discussion followed by Dean Kelly, Professors Wallace, L. Robinson, Smith, and Registrar Grimm. Because of the confusion resulting from the two changes, Professor Griffith moved that Resolution 85/12 be referred back to the Educational and Admissions Policy Committee for perfection of the changes made with instructions to return the resolution to the Senate for the April 11th meeting, if possible. The motion was seconded and carried.

(c) On behalf of the Student Financial Aid Committee, Professor Della Torre, Chair, moved the adoption of Resolution 85/13, "A Resolution on Financial Aid to Students," and the motion was seconded. Professor Della Torre said that the committee looked into the implications of the legislation before Congress on federal financial aid to students. Because the issues are very complicated, the committee recommended that a "worst" or "best" case analysis be made to give some clue as to how much money will be available for student financial aid. Professor Griffith said he wished to make clear that this resolution was not meant to criticize the present staff of the Student Financial Office in any way, as they are fully occupied in trying to keep up with the overwhelming flow of paperwork required to process student financial aid. They simply do not have the kind of expertise needed to make the required analysis nor do they have adequate computer-time. A discussion followed by Professors Levy, Della Torre, and Hill. The question was called, and Resolution 85/13 was adopted. (Resolution 85/13 attached.)

4 Under Introduction of Resolutions, Professor Tolchin moved the following resolution: "Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate of The George Washington University that the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate proceed to conduct informal discussions with appropriate members of the Board of Trustees to convey the full intent and meaning of Senate Resolution 85/11," and the motion was seconded. Professor David Robinson said that he opposed this resolution because it implies that any member of the Faculty Senate would have independent authorization to discuss with the Board of Trustees the position of faculty with respect to the selection of the President. Professor Hill responded that he had no problem with the resolution as he had full trust in the Chairman of the Executive Committee to explain the position of the Senate. Professor Griffith said that he understood Professor Robinson's point that the Chair of the Executive Committee was not a free agent to negotiate on behalf of the faculty in this situation; however, he did think that this resolution would give the Chair of the Executive Committee the authority to ask the President for access to the Board of Trustees. Professor Greene suggested that a "sense of the Senate" motion might be a more appropriate vehicle than a formal resolution. Discussion followed by Professors Levy, Tolchin, Morgan, and Griffith. Professor Tolchin said that she was willing to withdraw her resolution. She then moved the following motion: "That it is the sense of the Senate that the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate proceed to conduct informal discussions with appropriate members of the Board of Trustees to convey the full intent and meaning of Senate Resolution 85/11," and the motion was approved.

5 (a) On behalf of Professor Cheh, Professor Wallace said that with reference to the Report of the Special Committee in response to the Commission Report for the Year 2000, an analysis of the responses to the open-ened questions was being prepared under the direction of Professor Rycroft, and that the committee was in the process of refining two resolutions for the April Senate meeting. There was no discussion and the Report was received.

(b) On behalf of the Physical Facilities Committee, Professor Kenney, Chair, spoke briefly about the plans for development of the University yard, and he submitted a written Special Report for distribution with the minutes. (Report attached)

(c) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Griffith, Chair, nominated the following faculty for election to the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 1986-87 Session: Professors Sherwin Greene, Convener (SBGA), Mary M. Cheh (Law), John A. Frey (Columbian College), Honey W. Nashman (Education), Alvin E. Parrish (Medical), Robert W. Rycroft (SPIA), and Theodore G. Toridis (SEAS). Professor Morgan noted that three of the nominees will be leaving the Senate and he thought it a good principle to have Senate members participate in the nomination of its new Executive Committee for the new session. After discussion by Professors Griffith, Morgan, Wallace, Pierpont, and Levy, the Chair called for nominations from the floor. No nominations were made, and the nominees were elected to serve on the Nominating Committee.

(d) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Griffith, Chair, nominated the following faculty for election to a Special Mediation Committee in the complaint of Dr. Robert Egert: Stephen R. Chitwood, Professor of Public Administration, Chair; John P. Adams, Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery and of Child Health and Development; and Michael M. King, Professor of Chemistry. No nominations were made from the floor, and the nominees were elected to serve on the Special Mediation Committee.

5 (e) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Griffith reported on the following items: (1) The Board of Trustees approved the new Academic Dishonesty Policy with a few changes agreed to by the Academic Vice President, University Counsel, Co-Chairperson of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, and the Chairman of the Executive Committee. The new policy will be effective July 1, 1986. (2) The Board of Trustees approved the Senate's recommendation to amend Article III, Article X, and Paragraph E. for Implementing Article X of the Faculty Code. A recodification will be published this summer. (3) The Faculty Annual Luncheon will be held April 14, 1986, honoring members of the faculty who have served for twenty-five years and those attaining emeritus status. (4) The Executive Committee will meet March 28th to set the agenda for the April 11th Senate meeting, at which time resolutions from the Special Committee and the Standing Committees will be taken up in response to the Commission Report for the Year 2000.

Professor Griffith then invited Vice President Lange to report on the improvements in fringe benefits approved by the Board of Trustees. Dr. Lange described briefly the changes, and he said that the President was sending a letter to all members of the faculty and staff explaining in detail the changes approved by the Board.

6 Under Brief Statements, Professor Greene reported that the Advisory Committee on the Implementation of the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000 had met four times and plans to meet at an all-day meeting on April 18th. The committee has been asked to establish the basis for making priority decisions on some programs. Because of the Board's favorable response to the Commission Report, the committee has been allocated $100,000 seed money to move as quickly as possible toward implementation of the Commission Report. Professor Greene said that both he and Professor Lilien Robinson, as faculty members of the Advisory Committee, have been trying to address what the role of an advisory council should be in the future.

7 Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned by Vice President French at 4:07 p.m.

Theodore H. Grimm, Jr.
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT FACULTY CODE "PROCEDURES," SECTION C-5 (85/11)

WHEREAS, President Elliott is scheduled to retire on June 30, 1988; and

WHEREAS, Section C, subsection 5, of "Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code" states:

> "The Faculty Assembly shall elect a committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President;" and

WHEREAS, a Trustee Search Committee may be in place as early as the summer of 1987; and

WHEREAS, a Faculty Consultative Committee should, therefore, be elected by the Faculty Assembly no later than the Assembly's January 1987 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly should, therefore, adopt procedures for the election of a Faculty Consultative Committee no later than the Assembly's September 1986 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate, by precedent established in 1964, may offer guidance to the Assembly as to how it may fulfill the intent of the above-captioned section of the Faculty Code; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall introduce the following resolutions at the September 1986 meeting of the Faculty Assembly:

I. In order to carry into effect the Faculty's right to be consulted in the selection of a President, under Section C, subsection 5, of "Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code," the Faculty Assembly prescribes the following procedure to precede its election of a Faculty Consultative Committee at its January 1987 meeting:

 (A) Within four (4) weeks <u>after the September 1986 meeting</u> of the Faculty Assembly, the Senate representatives of the eight (8) academic divisions, to wit: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Medical Center, National Law Center, School of Education and Human Development, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Government and Business Administration, and School of Public and International Affairs, shall caucus to nominate to their respective faculties two or more members of those faculties;

(B) The several faculties are urgently requested to meet before December 31, 1986, to elect one member-designate to the Faculty Consultative Committee from the slate submitted by their Senate Representatives or by nomination and election from the floor;

(C) The Senate Representatives of the several faculties shall submit the names of persons thus elected to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on or before December 31, 1986; and

(D) The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall present for confirmation by the Faculty Assembly, at its January 1987 meeting, the resultant slate of nominees who will thereby be declared elected to serve as members of a Faculty Consultative Committee in fulfillment of the intent of the Faculty Code.

II. In order that the Faculty Consultative Committee, elected in January, 1987, participate meaningfully in the presidential selection process and avoid the isolation its predecessor suffered during the 1964-65 presidential succession, the Faculty Assembly recommends to the Faculty Consultative Committee the following:

(A) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall convene on the initiative of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, elect a chair, and provide for record-keeping;

(B) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall request the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof to accept some or all of its members ~~into~~ as full ~~participation~~ members of ~~with~~ the Trustee Search Committee for the duration of the presidential search. In the event that not all members of the Faculty Consultative Committee are so accepted, the Committee shall retain a separate order of business and confer regularly with those of its members who become active participants in the Trustee Search Committee.

(C) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall request of the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof that, whether some or all of its members are accepted ~~into~~ as full ~~participation~~ members of ~~with~~ the Trustee Search Committee:

(1) the Faculty Consultative Committee be accorded an active role in defining the criteria which the Trustee Search Committee will apply in its consideration of applicants; and

(2) the Trustee Search Committee give full and judicious consideration to any well-reasoned views which the Faculty Consultative Committee may express with respect to particular applicants.

(D) Within constraints imposed by the need for confidentiality, as defined by the Trustee Search Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee may, at its discretion, make interim reports to the Faculty Assembly and/or the Faculty Senate.

Special Committee on Senate Self-Study (Governance) and
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
February 21, 1986

Adopted, as amended, March 21, 1986

A RESOLUTION ON FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS (85/13)

WHEREAS, federal financial aid to students is being reduced; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Student Financial Aid considers that the University should strive to maintain the present level of financial assistance to students; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That temporary additional staff and computer support be provided to the Office of Student Financial Aid to study the impact of actual and anticipated reduction in federal aid funding on student enrollment at The George Washington University.

Committee on Student Financial Aid
March 5, 1986

Adopted March 21, 1986

SPECIAL REPORT
OF THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FACILITIES
THE STATUS OF PLANS FOR THE REHABILITATION OF
THE UNIVERSITY YARD

At its meeting on February 19th, 1985, the Committee received an invitation from Mr. Robert Dickman to provide input to the planning for the renewal of the University Yard, a project made possible by a generous gift from Mr. Oliver Carr. The Committee expressed its appreciation of the invitation and its enthusiasm for the task.

At the March meeting, the Committee discussed ways in which it might most effectively participate and noted that an ad hoc planning committee had been created which included the designated architect and that input was also being sought from other groups within the Community. The Committee instructed the Chairman to make contact with the ad hoc group so that our considerations might move in a convergent fashion.

Appreciating the need to stimulate broad input to the planning process, the Committee took the initiative through two of its members of organizing a display of photographs of the Yard in the lobby area of Lisner Hall. The display included a box for the submission of suggestions.

At its April meeting, the Committee developed its sense of priorities for the project and transmitted a list of nine specific objectives to the architect. The Committee met with Mr. Childs, the architect, on April 26th to discuss these proposals and again in October to discuss the development of the plan. At this latter meeting, the Committee expressed some reservations about and disappointment with* the proposed design but recognized that the final plan must reflect the best judgement of the donor and the ad hoc committee based on multiple inputs.

The Committee has been kept informed of the progress of the planning at each of it monthly meetings. The project has now passed into the design stage with the prospect of work commencing, and being in large part completed, before the start of the next academic year.

* Minutes of the January 21, 1986 meeting refer.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate March 7, 1986

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, March 21, 1986, at 2:10 p.m., in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of the Special Meeting of January 31, 1986, and the regular meeting of February 14, 1986

3. Resolutions:

 (a) A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT FACULTY CODE "PROCEDURES," SECTION C-5 (85/11); Professor Peter P. Hill, Chair, Special Committee on Senate Self-Study (Governance), and Professor William B. Griffith, Chair, Executive Committee (Resolution 85/11 attached)

 (b) A RESOLUTION ON SUMMER SESSIONS CALENDAR (85/12); Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, Educational and Admissions Policy Committee (Resolution 85/12 attached)

 (c) A RESOLUTION ON FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS (85/13); Professor Edward Della Torre, Chair, Student Financial Aid Committee (Resolution 85/13 attached)

4. Introduction of Resolutions

5. General Business:

 (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000; Professor Mary M. Cheh, Chair (Report attached)

 (b) Report of the Physical Facilities Committee on plans for development of the University yard; Professor Richard A. Kenney, Chair

 (c) Nomination for election of the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 1986-87 Session: Professors Sherwin Greene, Convener (SGBA), Mary M. Cheh (Law), John A. Frey (Columbian Col.),

5(c) cont'd:

Honey W. Nashman (Education), Alvin E. Parrish (Medical), Robert W. Rycroft (SPIA), and Theodore G. Toridis (SEAS)

(d) Nomination for election of a Special Mediation Committee in the complaint of Dr. Robert Egert, Department of Computer Medicine, Medical Center: Stephen R. Chitwood, Professor of Public Administration, Chair; John P. Adams, Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery and of Child Health and Development; and Michael M. King, Professor of Chemistry

(e) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor William B. Griffith, Chair

6 Brief Statements

7 Adjournment

Theodore H. Grimm, Jr.
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT FACULTY CODE "PROCEDURES," SECTION C-5 (85/11)

WHEREAS, President Elliott is scheduled to retire on June 30, 1988; and

WHEREAS, Section C, subsection 5, of "Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code" states:

> "The Faculty Assembly shall elect a committee to advise and consult with the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President;" and

WHEREAS, a Trustee Search Committee may be in place as early as the summer of 1987; and

WHEREAS, a Faculty Consultative Committee should, therefore, be elected by the Faculty Assembly no later than the Assembly's January 1987 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly should, therefore, adopt procedures for the election of a Faculty Consultative Committee no later than the Assembly's September 1986 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate, by precedent established in 1964, may offer guidance to the Assembly as to how it may fulfill the intent of the above-captioned section of the Faculty Code; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall introduce the following resolutions at the September 1986 meeting of the Faculty Assembly:

I. In order to carry into effect the Faculty's right to be consulted in the selection of a President, under Section C, subsection 5, of "Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code," the Faculty Assembly prescribes the following procedure to precede its election of a Faculty Consultative Committee at its January 1987 meeting:

(A) Within four (4) weeks of the ~~January 1987~~ September 1986 meeting of the Faculty Assembly, the Senate Representatives of the eight (8) academic divisions, to wit: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Medical Center, National Law Center, School of Education and Human Development, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Government and Business Administration, and School of Public and International Affairs, shall caucus to nominate to their respective faculties two or more members of those faculties;

(B) The several faculties are urgently requested to meet before December 31, 1986, to elect one member-designate to the Faculty Consultative Committee from the slate submitted by their Senate Representatives or by nomination and election from the floor;

(C) The Senate Representatives of the several faculties shall submit the names of persons thus elected to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on or before December 31, 1986; and

(D) The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall present for confirmation by the Faculty Assembly, at its January 1987 meeting, the resultant slate of nominees who will thereby be declared elected to serve as members of a Faculty Consultative Committee in fulfillment of the intent of the Faculty Code.

II. In order that the Faculty Consultative Committee, elected in January, 1987, participate meaningfully in the presidential selection process and avoid the isolation its predecessor suffered during the 1964-65 presidential succession, the Faculty Assembly recommends to the Faculty Consultative Committee the following:

(A) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall convene on the initiative of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, elect a chair, and provide for record-keeping;

(B) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall request the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof to accept some or all of its members into full participation with the Trustee Search Committee for the duration of the presidential search. In the event that not all members of the Faculty Consultative Committee are so accepted, the Committee shall retain a separate order of business and confer regularly with those of its members who become active participants in the Trustee Search Committee.

(C) The Faculty Consultative Committee shall request of the Board of Trustees or appropriate members thereof that, whether some or all of its members are accepted into full participation with the Trustee Search Committee:

(1) the Faculty Consultative Committee be accorded an active role in defining the criteria which the Trustee Search Committee will apply in its consideration of applicants; and

(2) the Trustee Search Committee give full and judicious consideration to any well-reasoned views which the Faculty Consultative Committee may express with respect to particular applicants.

(D) Within constraints imposed by the need for confidentiality, as defined by the Trustee Search Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee may, at its discretion, make interim reports to the Faculty Assembly and/or the Faculty Senate.

Special Committee on Senate Self-Study (Governance) and
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
February 21, 1986

A RESOLUTION ON SUMMER SESSIONS CALENDAR (85/12)

WHEREAS, the Academic Calendar (Resolution 84/13) approved by the Senate on January 18, 1985, did not fully accommodate the Summer Session needs of several schools; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Educational and Admissions Policy was asked to study the current Summer Sessions Calendar and make recommendations for changes; and

WHEREAS, the matter was considered at length by a committee representative of various schools, including those whose needs had not been fully met by the current Summer Sessions Calendar; and

WHEREAS, the proposed calendar will accommodate the expressed requirements of various schools; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the attached Calendar be accepted for Summer 1987 and that it serve as the model for future Summer Sessions Calendars.

Committee on Educational and Admissions Policy
February 27, 1986

SUMMER 1987

MAY

					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18 ◇	19 □	20	21	22	23
24	25 X	26	27	28	29	30
31						

JUNE

	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9 ○	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24 ○	25 □ ◇	26	27
28	29 □	30				

JULY

			1	2	3 X	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14 ○	15 □	16 ○	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29 □	30 ○	31 ○	

AUGUST

						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18 ○	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31 ◇					

◇ GENERAL REGISTRATION
X HOLIDAY
□ START OF CLASSES
○ END OF CLASSES

NOTE: Fall Semester 1987: Advising-Aug.27,28;Registration-Aug.31,Sept.1,2
Classes- Sept.2

SUMMER SESSIONS TIME PERIODS

May 19 ---5 wks (26 classes)--- June 24

June 25 5 wks (26 classes)---July 31

May 19 ---8 wks (39 classes) ---------- July 14

May 19 ---3 wks---- June 9

June 29 --- 3 wks --- July 16

July 15---5 wks ---Aug 18

July 29---3 wks--Aug 18

May 19 ---10 wks ----------July30

May 19 ---13 wks ----------Aug 18

EXPLANATION OF FROPOSED CALENDAR:

1. Two General Registration Dates: May 18 and June 25

 May 18 for classes beginning May 19 for the first 5-week session

 June 25 for classes beginning also on June 25 for the second 5-week session

2. Two Five-Week Sessions: May 19 -- June 24
 June 25 -- July 31

3. Additional Sessions which accommodate special needs of SGBA, SEHD, SEAS:

8-Week Early Session:	May 19 -- July 14	SGBA
5-Week Late Session:	July 15-- Aug 18	
Three 3-Week Sessions:	May 19 -- June 9	SEHD
	June 29 -- July 16	
	July 29 -- Aug 18	
10-Week Session:	May 19 -- July 30	SEAS
13-Week Session:	May 19 -- Aug 18	

4. Meeting days and time bands for the summer should provide, in so far as possible, the same amount of time provided by the 14-week Fall and Spring semesters of the new Calendar (i.e., 2,100 minutes of class contact time per semester)

A RESOLUTION ON FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS (85/13)

WHEREAS, federal financial aid to students is being reduced; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Student Financial Aid considers that the University should strive to maintain the present level of financial assistance to students; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That temporary additional staff and computer support be provided to the Office of Student Financial Aid to study the impact of actual and anticipated reduction in federal aid funding on student enrollment at The George Washington University.

Committee on Student Financial Aid
March 5, 1986

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

COMMITTEE REPORT

of

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE YEAR 2000

I. INTRODUCTION.

At the outset, we would like to thank the members of the Commission for the Year 2000 for their efforts in creating the Year 2000 Report. Theirs was an enormous undertaking and, although we have significant disagreements with the Report, we are grateful for their work. They have begun what should be viewed as a process of institutional self-evaluation and renewed commitment to excellence. Their Report, quite appropriately, has generated debate and even excitement concerning the future direction of the University.

We would also like to thank all of the faculty of the University who helped to shape and to inform our thinking about the Report. We benefited from their informal observations and from the data generated from the Faculty Questionnaires.

II. HOW THE COMMITTEE PROCEEDED.

It is important to understand how we conceived and carried out our work because our final conclusions have

been shaped by our conception of the task and the difficulties we encountered in trying to carry it out. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate initially decided to evaluate the Report by referring relevant recommendations to various Senate Committees. The Executive Committee quickly realized, however, that this parceling out of particular recommendations to separate Committees was unlikely to yield an overall evaluation of the Report and unlikely to be the best or most appropriate way to solicit reactions from individual faculty members. Therefore, the Executive Committee formed a Special Committee, our Committee, made up of one faculty member from each school. We were charged with analyzing the Report as a whole and generating individual faculty responses.

From the very beginning, our Committee was hampered by the ambiguous standing of the Report and ignorance of precisely how it was viewed by the Administration. Was the Report merely aspirational, was it a "talking document" designed to put issues before the University community, or was it a blueprint for change? If the document was to be implemented, was it to be implemented immediately or over time? What matters were to be taken up first? What priorities were to be assigned? Were alterations or changes to be permitted and, if so, at whose suggestion?

We felt that we could not possibly evaluate the Report until we knew what it was supposed to be and what it was supposed to do.

To find some answers to our questions, we prepared a set of inquiries and directed them to President Elliot. The questions and the responses are set out below. (They were also made a part of the Faculty Questionnaire:)

(1) Has the Board of Trustees formally or informally adopted the report? What does it mean to say that they have "received it?" Does it now have standing as official policy of the University, and what is that standing?

(2) Is the administration currently implementing the report or any part of it? What specific implementing actions has it taken or does it plan to take? Has the administration, in either considering or implementing the report, assigned priorities to the recommendations contained therein?

(3) As a general matter, does the Board of Trustees or the administration view the report and its recommendations as a plan for what must be done or only suggestions as to what could be done? Does the Board of Trustees or the administration view the report and its recommendations as a statement of what will not be done or are other options possible for the future?

President Elliot's reply, in a letter dated October 31, 1985 follows:

"In response to the questions raised in the letter of October 29 from Professor Mary M. Cheh regarding the Special Committee on the Report of the Commission for the Year 2000, I believe the actions of the Board of Trustees speak quite clearly to its disposition. An excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of May 16, 1985, will help us all, I believe, to understand what may be done in the implementation of the several recommendations contained in the report. Specifically, the Board of Trustees voted to:

1. receive the Report of the Commission for The Year 2000;

2. express its deep appreciation to the Commission for the serious study and hard work which each member has given to this timely and important task;

3. commend the Report to the administration and faculty for working out the details of the recommendations and the establishment of priorities; and

4. request of the administration regular reports as to the disposition of the various recommendations contained in the Report

Furthermore, the Board stands ready to consider recommendations arising from the Report at any time.

Responding to your further questions, I can report that the only recommendation to be implemented thus far is the establishment of a coordinated planning process and the first steps taken there are 1) the appointment of a university planning officer and 2) the appointment of an advisory council on University planning. It is important to point out that the administration has not assigned priorities to any recommendations contained in the Report and in fact is waiting for responses from appropriate constituencies of the University which hopefully will address that very question.

I can perhaps address your third group of questions by saying that the Report with its recommendations, constitutes more than a mere collection of random suggestions but on the other hand it does not offer a set of working drawings with completed plans for each program of the institution. It is fair to conclude that the Board of Trustees and the administration view the Report and its recommendations as the considered judgment of a competent group of our colleagues who did their level best to weigh the prospects and possibilities before this University within the immediate years ahead and made those recommendations within such a context. We would all agree, on the other hand, that the door is never closed on the consideration of other options which the future may make possible.

I trust the above comments will be helpful to you and to your committee. Addressing the importance of the several recommendations of the Commission, and the priorities which your committee may give to them, are indeed the kinds of advice which the administration is

seeking before proceeding to make any recommendations to the Board of Trustees. I look forward to your report."

LLoyd H. Elliott
[Signed]

It is fair to say, however, that, to this day, our committee remains baffled and uncertain about just how the Report will be used. Vice President French recently informed the Faculty Senate that the Report is "being implemented," but we still do not understand what this means.

Our first general observation flows out of this uncertainty. Although a University planning officer has been appointed and although an advisory planning committee has been formed, we are deeply concerned about the lack of clear statement about the status and standing of the Report. The Senate needs to know more precisely when and under what circumstances the Report and each of its recommendations will be taken up.

Another preliminary obstacle that our Committee encountered in carrying out its charge was how to solicit faculty response. It seemed almost foolish to send around another copy of the Report to each faculty member and simply ask, "what do you think?" We felt that we had to distill the essence of the Report and formulate some more precise questions. In doing this, we became aware of another major problem with the Report, namely, that it is not a unified or well-integrated document.

So, before we canvassed the faculty, we tried try to summarize of what we thought the Report was all about. We tried to identify what seemed to us to be unifying themes or organizing principles. The exercise was useful for us as a Committee and it also enabled us, we believe, to ask appropriate questions of the faculty.

We concluded that most of the Report's recommendations and observations could be organized around three main categories and one miscellaneous category. The three main categories were: 1) the University as a research institution, 2) questions of centralization and decentralization, unity and community, and 3) taking advantage of the University's Washington D.C. location.

After our synopsis was completed, the Committee then formulated a series of structured and open-ended questions for the faculty. We have already given the Senate some of the data from the Faculty Questionnaire (see Appendix A) but the results will remain incomplete until we can fully analyze the responses to the open-ended questions. This material is, we feel, extremely important because it not only clarifies what is contained in the quantitative data (see Appendix A), but also contains suggestions and perceptions which can greatly aid in decisions regarding the future of the University. An analysis of the

open-ended questions will be made available to the Senate as a supplementary report.

III. PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE.

Our Committee has given the Senate two documents that presented preliminary results of the Faculty Questionaire. The first is simply the total responses to all of structured questions and the second, made available at the recent special Senate meeting, is a very general analysis of some of these responses. If read with caution and with certain caveats in mind, we believe the results of the Questionnaire are extremely valuable. As previously indicated, the responses and the analysis are incorporated herein as Appendix A.

The caveats about using the data include the fact that the results represent the views of approximately 25% of the faculty. We would have preferred a higher response rate. We also know very little about the characteristics of the faculty who chose to respond. We feel, however, that, as a mechanism for obtaining feedback, the Questionnaire was highly useful.

We were quite suprised and gratified to discover that most of the survey respondents gave extensive comments to the open-ended questions. We are confident that the

experience of responding to the questionnaire was itself a means to inform the faculty and that their comments reflect a high degree of awareness and concern for the issues raised by the Report.

IV. OUR COMMITTEE'S VIEW OF THE REPORT.

If the Report is merely an occasion for the University to engage in self-examination, or if it is simply an agenda for discussion, then it is a very useful, highly successful document. It has stimulated discussion throughout the Unversity and has focused all constituencies on the need to plan if we are to become a better University.

If, however, the Report is supposed to be a planning document, then, we believe, it is seriously flawed. The flaws, in general, include the fact that the Report lacks a clear vision for the University and its role, and it lacks a unifying theme or themes. Moreover, many of its recommendations, even if laudable, are cast too generally to be useful. Other, more specific recommendations, e.g., that we have a new program emphasis in communications, are offered without justification, without relationship to other plans, without comparison with what else might have been chosen as a goal, without indication of cost or

what tradeoffs will be necessary, and, in general, without any context whatsoever. Furthermore, other central concerns of the faculty are either not taken up or are dealt with at such a level of generality that they are effectively not addressed. These topics include, for example, matters of faculty development and curriculum reform. In addition, the future of important segments of the University, such as the graduate and professional schools, is not even addressed. The Report also makes no attempt to integrate its recommendations with the master plan for campus development (physical facilities) or with present or future resources. Finally, if viewed as a planning document, the Report is deficient because it fails to establish priorities.

Many of these shortcomings were explicity or implicity identified in the separate committee reports to the Senate during the recent special meeting to consider the Report. The committees frequently suggested that they were hampered by a lack of information about specific recommendations and were unclear about how endorsement of a recommendation would matter. This reaction comports with Faculty Questionnaire responses which displayed a high degree of concern about tradeoffs and priorities. (For example, many faculty members agreed that there should be more emphasis on research but they were concerned lest this meant a deemphasis on teaching.)

In our view, a proper planning document would first identify and define its objectives. We believe there are two main objectives which are related but distinct: 1) to create a top quality academic institution and 2) to enhance our reputation as such an institution. With these objectives in mind, the Report, as a planning document, would have then focused on the basic ingredients which make a university great, namely, a strong faculty, quality students, first rate facilities, and a commitment to scholarly production. It would have also identified the current strengths and weaknesses of the University. Finally it would have examined how the University can better project its image.

Necessarily this approach would mean focusing on matters such as faculty recruitment, faculty support schemes, facilities planning, revenue projections, and curriculum reform. It would draw upon current literature and data regarding students of the future and developing areas of interest in the arts, sciences, and the professions. It would address questions such as: Why are current liberal arts programs, nationwide, undergoing a process of revitalization? Where will the faculty of the future come from? What inducements will be needed to keep the brightest and most productive younger faculty?

From this kind of study and approach, the University could then develop detailed 5-year, 10-year, and 20-year plans identifying specific objectives and goals. These plans would state where the University wants to be in the relevant time period, and they would specifically identify immediate, critical needs, i.e., things that must be done right away (e.g., new labs and classrooms) and priority needs, i.e., things, whether or not urgent, which must be given preference over other objectives.

The current Report does none of these things and our Committee finds that it is inadequate as a planning document. Wholly apart from the wisdom of any particular recommendations contained in the Report, the document as a whole fails to present an integrated, coherent, or overall plan on which to take specific short or long-term actions.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Committee considered recommending that there be a new Year 2000 Report or that there be a supplement to the current Report. In thinking about this, however, we realized that one of the reasons that the current Report is inadequate is that a Report such as we envision can never arise from a single University committee. No matter

how talented, no matter how well intentioned, a group of 11 administrators and faculty simply cannot capture the different needs and different perspectives of all of the University's schools and divisions and will necessarily and inevitably produce a document with a kind of cut-and-paste look. It became obvious to us that comprehensive and effective planning can only come from the individual schools themselves. They best know their strengths, their weaknesses, and their needs. They are in the best position to assess trends and developments in their areas. This, therefore, is where planning must start and where much of the groundwork must be laid for future University decisions.

At the same time, our Committee also concluded that individual schools are probably not the best or most reliable judge of decisions to be made for the University as a whole and that, therefore, there is a need for a University-wide planning body. This body should make judgments about tradeoffs and priorities with the raw materials of its decisions being the individual school plans. If properly reconstituted, the newly created advisory committee for Year 2000 might be an appropriate University planning body. This body, which we believe must be made more representative than it is now, would

then be charged with bringing together and publicizing an overall plan for the University. Individual school plans, once completed and periodically updated, would be coordinated by the Advisory Committee.

With respect to the school plans, we believe that procedures should be put in place so that every school, as a school, (Deans, faculty, students, and alumni) can begin to develop 5-year, 10-year and 20-year plans for the future. The plans must bring together goals, academic planning, facilities development, budgeting, projected demographics, and trends in the relevant curriculum areas. The Advisory Committee might set as its first task the development of guidelines for the schools to follow in putting together their plans. It might also devise a standard for determining what kinds of decisions are purely internal school decisions and what kinds of decisions are general University-wide matters.

With respect to the Advisory Planning Committee, since its role will be so important, it is crucial that it include more than the current two faculty members (out of 10) and that it also include an alumni member. It must have staff and each member must be able to draw upon the expertise and time of the staff. Members must also have

complete access to all information necessary to its task. Obviously each member of the Planning Committee must be prepared to undertake what will be an important and time consuming obligation. The committee must periodically report to the university community about its work, its agenda, and its decisions.

To implement these ideas, our Committee will, at a subsequent meeting, offer a resolution for the Senate's consideration.

Whatever may become of our Committee's suggestions on planning, we have an immediate and deep concern that the Report is currently being implemented notwithstanding the fact that a complete faculty response has yet to be heard. Although it is true that the University cannot come to a halt awaiting faculty reaction to ongoing plans, a full explanation of what is being implemented and with what priorities should be given to the faculty as soon as possible. We are also eager to insure that the faculty be kept abreast of all implementation plans as they unfold in the future. Toward that end and to ensure that the faculty has a continuing role in plans for the University's future, our Committee will, at a subsequent meeting, offer a second resolution asking that the administration make

regular and periodic reports of implementing action and that these reports be made, so far as is possible, prior to any action being taken.

Respectfully submitted,

Members of the Special Committee

Professor Mary M. Cheh, Chair
Assoc. Professor Michael S. Castleberry
Professor Edward Della Torre
Professor Sherwin Greene
Professor Joseph B. Levy
Professor Alvin E. Parrish
Associate Professor Robert W. Rycroft
Professor Ruth A. Wallace

February 27, 1986

UNIVERSITY GIVE RESULT-

Appendix A - Part I

B. Synopsis and Questionnaire

Although the authors of the Report specifically resisted ranking their recommendations, it is plain that three main themes are central.

1. The University As A Research Institution

The first is that the University should emphasize and develop its research capability. The major recommendation is that

> "the University establish plans that will enable it to develop into a research institution of the first rank." (p. 12)

In the Report, there is little mention of community service, e.g., service to patients, consumers, residents, the neighborhood, and so on. And, although other recommendations speak to the need to support research and teaching, i.e.,

> - - -"The University should initiate additional steps to support faculty development in research and teaching" (p. 25, emphasis supplied); and
>
> - - -At the earliest possible time, the University should provide modern laboratories for teaching, in the natural sciences and engineering, and additional facilities to support research and teaching in these areas." (p. 28, emphasis supplied).

plainly the major emphasis is placed on research. In particular the report calls for greater emphasis on research priorities in decisions concerning hiring, tenure, promotion, and compensation of faculty (p. 12).

We would like to know the faculty's view of the proper balance between research, teaching, and community service.

(1) - Do you agree that we should place more emphasis on the University as a research institution? N = 264

Strongly Agree 140/53% Agree 91/34% Neutral 17/6% Disagree 18/7%

Strongly Disagree 3/1%

(2) - If you "strongly agree" or "agree," should this be accomplished, if necessary, by shifting resources away from teaching and community service or should it be done only by maintaining the current level of commitment to teaching and community service and finding new resources and new money for research? N = 228

Shift resources, if necessary 86/38% Only with new resources 142/62%

(3) Please give us your opinion about the appropriate balance between research, teaching, and community service.

Comments*:

2. Centralization/Decentralization

The second main theme concerns the decentralization of the schools and colleges of the University. The Report identifies what

*[In answering questions asking for comment, please use the reverse side of the paper if space is inadequate.]

it calls "Barriers to Development" and lists, first, excessive self criticism and a weak internal image. Whether this is accurate or not, presumably we can all agree that we should adopt (or earn) a more confident, positive self image. The second barrier, however, is described as the decentralization and "nearly complete independence" of the separate schools and colleges. The Report states that: "At this stage in the history of the University decentralization presents some major drawbacks to further development" (p.9)

Many of the Report's more specific recommendations attempt to deal with the problems of decentralization. Although not identified as such, the Report seems to see the centralization/decentralization problem in two dimensions, both of which necessarily overlap. One is academic and the other is administrative.

With respect to academic centralization, the Report calls, for example, for a review of the undergraduate program of general education in the near future noting that "[d]ecentralization of responsibility for the undergraduate curriculum in the schools and departments is probably the most important cause of the de-emphasis of general education." (p. 14) In this same vein, it calls for the development of "coherent inter-school programs of study." (p. 17) In this regard, the most significant emphasis seems to be on "Columbian college [as] the cornerstone of the University" (p. 30). The thrust is to strengthen the role and responsibilities of Columbian College (of itself, probably a desirable goal) and

implicitly to de-emphasize the prominence and relative autonomy of the professional schools.

(4) - Do you agree that schools and colleges now exercise too great autonomy? N = 250

Strongly Agree 49/20% Agree 65/26% Neutral 61/24% Disagree 47/19%

Strongly Disagree 28/11%

Comments:

(5) - Do you agree that we should strive to develop more inter-school programs of study? N = 257

Strongly Agree 84/33% Agree 125/49% Neutral 37/14% Disagree 8/3%

Strongly Disagree 3/1%

Comments:

(6) Do you agree that we should strengthen Columbian College? N = 256

Strongly Agree [illegible] Agree 77/30% Neutral 46/18% Disagree 10/4%

Strongly Disagree 6/2%

Comments:

(7) If you answered "strongly agree" or "agree" in question (6), should we do so even if it means a deemphasis on the prominence of the graduate and professional schools? N = 191

Strongly Agree 13/7% Agree 32/17% Neutral 17/9% Disagree 56/29%

Strongly Disagree 74/39%

Comments:

Related to the idea of centralization is the idea of union, i.e., the desire to create and build a true university community. The following recommendations pick up the theme of union:

> ---"The University should continue to build faculty morale and take new steps to foster a sense of academic community" (p. 25) and
>
> ---The University should continue to work with student groups to provide a program of all-University activities that promote the development of a campus community." (p. 27)

and relatedly,

> ---"The University should take steps to strengthen the position of the performing arts within the liberal arts and to enable the performing arts to play a more important role in the life of the campus." (p. 20)

(8) Do you agree that there is a need to foster a greater sense of a university? N = 259

Strongly Agree 130/50% Agree 103/40% Neutral 18/7% Disagree 6/2%

Strongly Disagree 2/1%

Comments:

(9) -If you agree that there is a need for greater union, should it be met, in part with steps to strengthen the performing arts? N = 24

Strongly Agree 20/8% Agree 80/33% Neutral 89/36% Disagree 32/13%

Strongly Disagree 18/7%

Comments:

(10) - If you agree that there is need for greater union, should it be met, in part, with a greater emphasis on University sports activities? N = 243

Strongly Agree 12/5% Agree 72/30% Neutral 67/28% Disagree 56/23%

Strongly Disagree 39/16%

Comments:

(11) - If you agree that there is any need for greater union, do you have any other comments or ideas about how to satisfy it?

With respect to administrative centralization, the chief recommendation is that

> "[t]he University should develop a coordinated planning process to support its efforts for significantly greater academic quality and distinction." (p. 31).

The Report notes that, "[t]he Commission envisions a planning process that preserves the strength of the schools and supports their ability to innovate," (p. 31) but plainly far greater central coordination and review is contemplated. Indeed this appears to be the most important "centralizing" recommendation, and it is the first recommendation on which the University has taken action (see President Elliot's October 31st letter).

(12) - Do you agree that there should be greater centralization of planning decisions (such as each school's program emphases, hiring and staffing, and budget needs)? N = 248

Strongly Agree 29/12% Agree 78/31% Neutral 49/20% Disagree 57/23%

Strongly Disagree 35/14%

Comments:

3. Washington, D.C. Location

The third main point is that the University should take full advantage of its location in Washington D.C. As the Report notes,

> "The University's location presents students and faculty with opportunities for involvement with government agencies, foreign countries, international organizations, public policy organizations, scientific facilities, and private corporations." (p. 6).

The Washington location tie-in has two principal components. The first is that, in addition to students enrolled from around the country, we draw a distinctive Washington D.C. student body, namely

the part-time professional student and the continuing education student. The Report makes no specific recommendation as to part-time students but (at p. 6) identifies "an ongoing commitment to the part-time student" as a salient feature of the University and (at p. 7) notes that, economically speaking, "the opportunities the University provides for part-time study have been important in the past, and they will continue to be important in the future." The Report specifically recommends that

> "The Division of Continuing Education and Summer Sessions should be reorganized to clarify its role and activities . . ." (p. 23)

13.- Do you agree that we should make a special committment to provide opportunities for part-time and continuing education students? N = 255

Strongly Agree 96/38% Agree 117/46% Neutral 27/11% Disagree 11/4%

Strongly Disagree 5/2%

Comments:

The other aspect of the University's D.C. location is the view that we should develop distinctive Washington-related and Washington-strengthened programs. Four programmatic recommendations, placed under the heading of "Distinctive Aspirations", pick up this theme. They are:

> (a) RECOMMENDATION: <u>The University should develop an international emphasis in all schools and colleges</u>. (p. 35)

(14) -Do you agree? N = 259

Strongly Agree 66/25% Agree 73/28% Neutral 69/27% Disagree 38/15%

Strongly Disagree 13/5%

Comments:

(b) RECOMMENDATION: The University should develop the present School of Public and International Affairs to serve as the cornerstone for the University's diverse programs in international affairs. (p. 36);

(15) - Do you agree? N = 251

Strongly Agree 39/16% Agree 82/33% Neutral 81/32% Disagree 27/11%

Strongly Disagree 22/9%

Comments:

(c) RECOMMENDATION: The University should initiate steps that will result in the strengthening of its research capability in the area of government. The University should also make a major effort to offer students in every school and college a unique opportunity to relate their studies to the processes of modern government. (p. 40)

(16) - Do you agree that we should strenghten our research capability in the area of government? N = 258

Strongly Agree 53/21% Agree 125/48% Neutral 46/13% Disagree 23/9%

Strongly Disagree 10/4%

Comments:

(d) RECOMMENDATION: The University should develop a Center for the Study of Public Policy to aid in developing new research programs, particularly those which emphasize multidisciplinary activities, and to facilitate and strengthen current faculty research. (p. 42).

(17) - Do you agree? N = 260

Strongly Agree 58/22% Agree 102/39% Neutral 62/24% Disagree 35/10%

Strongly Disagree 12/5%

Comments:

The above recommendations also pick-up the theme of greater University wide coordination and centralization.

The Report does not specifically state that our Washington, D.C. location calls for a greater University committment to the Washington metropolitan community.

(18) - Do you agree that the Report should include a greater emphasis on the University's committment to the Washington metropolitan community? N = 252

Strongly Agree 34/13% Agree 75/30% Neutral 76/30% Disagree 52/21%

Strongly Disagree 15/6%

Comments:

Other Recommendations

In addition to these general themes, the Report makes additional recommendations. One of these is a call for "a major new program emphasis in the field of communications" (p. 18)

(19) - Do you agree that we should have a new program emphasis in communications (the media, broadcasting, and so on)? N = 253

Strongly Agree 20/8% Agree 69/27% Neutral 88/35% Disagree 42/17%

Strongly Disagree 32/13%

Comments:

(20) - Do you agree that we should pursue this new program emphasis even if it means cutting back in other areas? N = 243

Strongly Agree 5/2% Agree 20/8% Neutral 26/11% Disagree 99/41%

Strongly Disagree 93/38%

Comments:

(21) - What other programs should be added, developed, or strengthened?

Please Comment:

There are also several recommendations that call for greater use of technology and computers.

> RECOMMENDATION: The University should support the three libraries in their acquisition of the technology needed to provide access to information and material appropriate to a research university of quality and to manage increasingly complex library operations. (p. 22)
>
> RECOMMENDATION: Technology must play a greater role in all the University's educational programs, research activities, and administrative operations. (p. 45)
>
> RECOMMENDATION: The University should rationalize and substantially expand its use of computer systems for educational and administrative purposes. (p. 48)

(22) - Do you have any comments on the technology/computers recommendations?

Comments:

Finally, there are a number of general and randomly offered recommendations, some of which may be controversial but most of which are, as general propositions without a priority ranking, difficult to critique. They are:

> RECOMMENDATION: The University should review the undergraduate program of general education in the near future. (p. 15);

(23) Comments:

RECOMMENDATION: The University should continue to build faculty morale ... (p. 25);

(24) Comments:

RECOMMENDATION: The University should provide more financial assistance in the form of loans and scholarships. To help support expanded programs, student financial aid should receive high priority in fund-raising. (p. 26);

(25) Comments:

The Report makes only one specific recommendation concerning facilities. That recommendation is:

RECOMMENDATON: At the earliest possible time, the University should provide modern laboratories for teaching in the natural sciences and engineering, and additional facilities to support research and teaching in these areas. (p. 28).

With respect to facilities, the Report sees modern laboratories as the University's most critical need. It mentions, but makes no recommendation about, the need to "establish plans for the expansion of both the Marvin Center and the Smith Center" (Pp. 29-30), a future need for renovations in the George Washington University Hospital, and a general need to update all facilities as time proceeds. There is also a call, although not a recommendation, for the University to "acquire land in a suburban location to provide for current needs to give the institution flexibility in developing future research and instructional opportunities." (p. 29)

The main emphasis, however, is on facility development related to building the University's research capability.

(26) - Do you agree with this emphasis? N = 245

Strongly Agree 86/35% Agree 92/37% Neutral 41/17% Disagree 18/7%

Strongly Disagree 4/4%

Comments:

(27) - What facilities would you list as most in need of development and attention?

(28) - Do you agree that the University should expand its programs in suburban locations? N = 246

Strongly Agree 29/12% Agree 54/22% Neutral 75/32% Disagree 48/20%

Strongly Disagree 37/15%

Comments:

As to the Report in general,

(29) - In general, do you agree that the Report's recommendations should be given priorities before steps are taken to implement them? N=23

Strongly Agree 8/33% Agree 10/44% Neutral 3/16% Disagree 1/4%

Strongly Disagree 5/2%

Comments:

(30) - Does the Report omit significant considerations that you think should be addressed? Please state.

(31) - What overall comments would you like to make?

Thank you.

APPENDIX A
PART II

SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

The university-wide faculty responses to the Year 2000 questionnaire are displayed in Table 1, with the "strongly agree" and "agree" categories collapsed and the same done for "strongly disagree" and "disagree." As this table shows, several of the questions elicited dramatic response patterns. Fully half the questions featured more than two-thirds of the total respondents falling into either the collapsed agree or disagree categories (the underlined cells in the table). The strongest positive faculty responses were in support of fostering a greater sense of university, placing more emphasis on the University as a research institution, making a special commitment to part-time and continuing education students, and developing more inter-school programs of study. Almost as strong were the support levels for giving the Year 2000 report priorities prior to implementing it, strengthening Columbian College, improving facility development related to the University's research capability, and strengthening research in the area of government. Thus, the faculty appears to support a variety of recommendations in both the teaching and research arenas.

On the negative side, the faculty respondents do not appear ready to make cutbacks in existing programs in order to pursue a new communications program. Nor do they support the strengthening of Columbian College if doing so means a deemphasis on the graduate and professional schools. Resource trade-offs appear to be a sensitive issue.

Perhaps equally striking are the patterns of responses to questions about expanding programs into suburban areas, the creation of a communications program emphasis, and using sports activities as a vehicle for fostering greater union. On each of these issues, the respondents were split almost exactly down the middle. Almost as equally divisive were questions about deemphasizing the degree of school and college autonomy, centralizing planning, making a greater

commitment to the Washington metropolitan area, and strengthening the performing arts to enhance a sense of unity.

TABLE 1.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE RESULTS OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Percent Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent Neutral	Percent Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
1. Emphasize Research	87	6	8
4. Too Great Autonomy	46	24	30
5. More Inter-School Programs	82	14	4
6. Strengthen Columbian	76	18	6
7. Deemphasize Professional	24	9	68
8. Foster Sense of University	90	7	3
9. Strengthen Performing Arts	41	36	20
10. Emphasize Sports	35	28	39
12. Centralize Planning	43	20	37
13. Continuing, Part-time Students	84	11	6
14. International Emphasis	53	27	20
15. International Cornerstone SPIA	49	32	20
16. Government Research Strengthening	69	18	13
17. Center for Study of Public Policy	61	24	15
18. Commitment to Washington	43	30	27

Table 1, continued.

Question	Percent Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent Neutral	Percent Disagree/ Strongly Disagree
19. Communications Program	35	35	30
20. Communications If Other Cutbacks	10	11	79
26. Research Facility Development	72	17	11
28. Expand Suburban Locations	34	32	35
29. Give Report Priorities	77	16	6